

11 NOV 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

VIA: Chief, Functional Training Division

FROM: [REDACTED]

Co-Chairmen, Intelligence Process Course  
Intelligence Training Branch

25X1A

SUBJECT: Course Report, Intelligence Process Course  
No. 1-78, 3-28 October 1977 (U)

The four-week, full-time Intelligence Process Course (IPC) was held from 3-28 October. The course objectives were generally met without significant problems. Post-course test scores indicated a considerable improvement over the pre-test scores (see Part 4). Student reaction was favorable and class attitude was good.

1. (U/AIUO) Student Participation

The class responded to most of the speakers with relevant questions, which often led to a productive discussion. In at least one instance, class participation bailed out an unprepared speaker and converted a 15-minute lecture into an interesting and informative hour session. Class participation and interaction was increased by two mechanisms: a group seating arrangement and presentation panels.

The class was seated in groups of four at tables arranged so that each student could view the speaker, as well as his classmates. The name plates were randomly distributed each morning to facilitate a more complete exchange of ideas and information.

A review and discussion of much of the information presented by the speakers was furthered by four scheduled student panel presentation sessions. These sessions were held after at least five different subjects had been presented in the course. Each panel session involved all of the students in groups of three or four per panel. Panel membership was changed for each session, with each student

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Course Report, Intelligence Process Course,  
No. 1-78, 3-28 October 1977

chairing one panel. Subject assignments for each panel were made approximately one hour before the presentations. Several of the panels were videotaped and played back for student viewing. At the very least it appears that the panels increased the amount of note-taking in class and thus probably aided the learning process. Several of the panels stimulated an in-depth discussion on a subject. An additional benefit was that of breaking the monotony of lectures.

2. (C) Student Observations and Suggestions

Student comments on the course were mixed, as usual. They primarily displayed individual interest with some consensus of very good and poor presentations. The students viewed the NPIC and [REDACTED] presentations as outstanding and the DIA and the NIO on Nuclear Proliferation presentations as very poor.

25X1A

The course was rated 5.1 on a 1 to 7 scale.

The students suggested that information be given about an office prior to the lectures. Many seemed to enjoy the student-panel sessions, and comments were directed at improving the substantive quality of the presentations.

A few felt that they had definitely missed something by not visiting NSA. Other student comments covered the entire range of the course, but lacked any consensus.

3. (U/AIUO) Problems Encountered

The course ran smoothly. The facilities (room 912) were barely adequate; more than 20 students would preclude the grouped seating arrangement used in this course. Two schedule changes were required in the course and were accomplished without disruption.

4. (C) Results of Course Changes

Several changes were made in IPC No. 1-78. Most of the offices that provided lectures or sent students to the course were contacted in a pre-course survey. The course chairmen discussed course objectives, content, and the respective office contributions. These discussions resulted in some schedule revision, and also in additional students from OWI and OSI.

2  
CONFIDENTIAL

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/04/19 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100020001-8

SUBJECT: Course Report, Intelligence Process Course,  
No. 1-78, 3-28 October 1977

A 25-question, multiple choice test was given on the first and last morning of this IPC. The pre-course and post-course test were used to derive an indication of course effectiveness and to have a basis for looking at the impact of present and future course changes. The same test was used both before and after the course. However, the students were given only the range of scores and the average score from the first test. After the post-course test, the test was reviewed and discussed, and each student was given his pre-test and post-test score. The average test score improvement was 25 percent. The review and discussion of the test, although brief, served as a learning mechanism.

The writing exercises were dropped and the briefing exercises were incorporated into the student panel discussions previously mentioned. These presentations were videotaped and played back for critique and review.

The orientation and training provided by ITG to the course co-chairmen prior to the course were invaluable. It permitted much greater schedule flexibility. Support was always cheerfully and effectively provided by ITG, but because of the training received the co-chairmen were able to adjust schedules and run the optional noon movies, which would otherwise have placed unreasonable demands on the support personnel.

[REDACTED] was viewed by the class in conjunction with a lecture on DDS&T technical collection and was well received. Presentations restored included INR, OSO, and OTS, and all seemed to be effective additions to the course.

25X1A

The requirements panel was moved to the end of the course. This was out of phase with the rest of the course, which followed the intelligence cycle, but it seemed effective as it was presented after the students had acquired the vocabulary of the craft and was near the consumer phase which put requirements more in the context of the collection objectives.

In discussions on the next-to-last day, it was determined that the students felt that the roles of [REDACTED] and the DDS&T were not fully understood. We therefore took advantage of some available time on the final day by scheduling two additional panel presentations on these subjects.

25X1A

Approved For Release 2000/04/19 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100020001-8

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/04/19 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100020001-8  
SUBJECT: Course Report, Intelligence Process Course,  
No. 1-78, 3-28 October 1977

5. (U/AIUO) Future Changes and Innovations

We believe several additional changes can be made to increase the effectiveness of the course.

Briefings by the course chairman on the structure and general functions of the Directorates should be given before the office presentations. This should provide a better overview and also focus and stimulate student questions and discussion.

More reading material will be provided in the form of office products, wiring diagrams, etc. Information relating to an individual office would be available the day before, during, and the day after the presentation. This would add variety and relevance to the reading material as well as incentive to keep up with the course.

The first week of the course should be held at to better break office ties and to increase the students focus on the subject matter. Additional material can be presented and reviewed during evening sessions.

25X1A

We recommend that the changes incorporated in IPC No. 1-78 be retained and that the suggested changes be implemented before the next running of the non-CT IPC course scheduled in March.

6. (U/AIUO) Class Composition

The average age, CIA employment, and grade was 33 years, 4 1/2 years, and GS-10. The class represented a good cross section of the Agency.

25X1A

Attachments:

- 1 - Course Roster
- 2 - Course Schedule
- 3 - Course Evaluation
- 4 - End-of-Course Data Sheet

**CONFIDENTIAL**